

## REMARKS

This reply is in response to the restriction requirement mailed on June 29, 2004 in which a restriction requirement was imposed upon Claims 29-65. With this reply, Claims 30, 56 and 57 are cancelled; Claims 29, 58 and 59 are amended; and Claims 66-71 are added. Claims 29, 31-55 and 58-71 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### I. Election of Claims 29-55 and 58-65.

Page 2 of the Office Action imposes a restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 by asserting that the claims are directed to two distinct inventions: Invention I—Claims 29-55 and 58-65 drawn to a media processing device and a method for processing media; and Invention II—Claims 56-57, drawn to a support. In response, Applicant hereby elects Invention I—Claims 29-55 and 58-65. With this Response, non-elected Claims 56-57 are cancelled.

### II. Examiner Interviews Summaries.

On June 25, 2004 and July 22, 2004, telephonic interviews were held between Examiner Liang and Applicant's attorney, Todd A. Rathe. Claims 29 and 64 were discussed. Although no specific agreement was reached with respect to Claim 29, it was tentatively agreed upon that Claim 64 would be allowable over the prior art of record. It was also tentatively agreed upon that the subject matter of Claims 66, 68 and 70, added with this reply, would also be patentably distinct over the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated that a review of the exact wording of Claims 66, 68 and 70 would be needed.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Liang for the opportunity to discuss the rejection of the claims and for Examiner Liang's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the prior art of record.

### III. Added Claims.

With this reply, Claims 66-71 are added. Added Claim 66 recites a media processing device which includes a support pivotally coupled to an enclosure of a media processing

engine. The support pivots between a first position in which the support is configured to wrap about the top edge of a wall and a second position in which the support is configured to rest upon a horizontal surface so as to elevate at least a portion of the enclosure of the device above the horizontal surface. The prior art of record fails to disclose such a support.

Accordingly, added Claim 66 and Claim 67 which depends from Claim 66 are presented for consideration and allowance.

Added Claim 68 recites a media processing device which includes a media processing engine, an enclosure about the engine and a media receiver pivotally coupled to the enclosure. The media receiver pivots between a first position in which the media receiver is configured to extend along the wall and a second position in which the receiver is configured to extend along the horizontal surface. The prior art of record fails to disclose a media processing device having such a receiver. Accordingly, added Claim 68 and Claim 69 which depends from Claim 68 are presented for consideration and allowance.

Added Claim 70 recites a media processing device including a media processing engine, an enclosure about the engine, a support and a media receiver. The support pivots between a first position in which the support is configured to mount along a side of the wall and a second position in which the support is configured to rest upon the horizontal surface so as to elevate at least a portion of the enclosure above the horizontal surface. The media receiver is pivotally coupled to the enclosure and pivots between a third position in which the media receiver is configured to extend along the wall while the support is in the first position and a fourth position in which the receiver is configured to extend along the horizontal surface while the support is in the second position. The prior art of record fails to disclose a media processing device having the claim support and media receiver. Accordingly, added Claim 70 and Claim 71 which depends from Claim 70 are presented for consideration and allowance.

#### IV. Conclusion.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 29, 31-55 and 58-71 are now pending in this application.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 28, 2004

By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22879  
Telephone: (414) 297-5710  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,276